

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has canceled all previously pending claims and replaced them with new claims 19-32. New claim 19 corresponds generally to original claim 1, with amendments; new claim 26 corresponds generally to original claim 9, with amendments.

Claims 19-32 are pending. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

### **The Claims, Generally**

The previously pending claims have been canceled and replaced with new claims 19-32. The claims are directed to embodiments such as shown in FIG. 5 of the application, which are protruding units that have linear distal ends all offset the same direction and generally the same distance.

Claims 19-25 are directed to an abrasive array of a plurality of protruding units. Claim 19 is similar to previous claim 1, with additional features defined. Support for these additional features can be found, for example, in originally filed claim 2 and FIGS. 4E, 4G, 5 and 6B and their discussion. Claim 20 is supported, for example, by page 22, line 29 to page 23, line 1. Claim 21 is similar to original claim 6. Claim 22 is the opposite of claim 21. Claim 23 is supported by, for example, FIGS. 4E and 6B. Claim 24 is similar to original claim 8. Claim 25 is supported, for example, by page 9, line 22 through page 11, line 13.

Claims 26-32 are directed to an abrasive array of a plurality of protruding units. Claim 26 is similar to previous claim 9, with additional features defined. Support for these additional features can be found, for example, in originally filed claim 10 and FIGS. 4E, 4G, 5 and 6B and their discussion. Claim 27 is supported, for example, by page 22, line 29 to page 23, line 1. Claim 28 is similar to original claim 14. Claim 29 is the opposite of claim 28. Claim 30 is supported by, for example, FIGS. 4E and 6B. Claim 31 is similar to original claim 16. Claim 32 is supported, for example, by page 9, line 22 through page 11, line 13.

No new matter has been added.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

Presented herein are the amendments to the specification previously made in the paper filed May 16, 2006, identified now by the page and line number of originally filed paper application, rather than the paragraph number as in the published application.

The amendments made address the various concerns about the specification and the drawings raised in the May 23, 2006 and previous Office Action(s).

### **Section 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hoopman (U.S. Patent No. 5,672,097). The Office Action relies on the same reasons as set forth in the previous Office Actions (of December 20, 2005 and October 20, 2004). Applicant continues to respectfully disagree with this rejection.

As described above, the new claims are more defined than previously and are directed to embodiments such as illustrated in FIG. 5 of the application.

Hoopman does not teach that the distal region of each of the protruding units is offset in from the center the same direction and the generally the same distance. As previously discussed, Hoopman teaches a random offset, both direction and distance.

Applicant contends that it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art of structured abrasives to create a protruding units and abrasive articles as recited, based on the random abrasive composites of Hoopman. Applicant contends that the pending claims are patentable over Hoopman, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **Double Patenting Rejection**


Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of co-pending application no. 10/668,799. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot.

**Summary**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Dan Biesterveld, Reg. No. 45,898, at 651.737.3193.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug 23, 2006

  
Mara E. DeBoe  
Reg. No. 40,066